



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/042,316	01/11/2002	Osamu Shimomura	HAN 130	4413
23995	7590	06/01/2006	EXAMINER	
RABIN & Berdo, PC 1101 14TH STREET, NW SUITE 500 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			NGUYEN, CAM LINH T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2161	

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/042,316

Applicant(s)

SHIMOMURA ET AL.

Examiner

CamLinh Nguyen

Art Unit

2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 March 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office Action is response to amendment filed on 3/6/2006.
2. Claims 1 – 16 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Okumo et al (U.S. 5,455,941).

♦ As per claim 1,

Okumo et al (U.S. 5,455,941) discloses a document management system for limiting user access to a registered document, comprising:

- “A first storage means for registering a document to be accessed” See Fig. 1, element 20, Fig. 2, col. 5, lines 50 – 52, col. 6, lines 1 - 2.
- “A second storage means for registering access controlling information including a specific character string and identification data” See Fig. 1, element 30, col. 5, lines 52 – 59.
- The controlling information including a specific character string and identification data for specifying said access controlling information” See col. 6, lines 17 – 52 wherein

Art Unit: 2161

- A specific character string corresponds to text element was appended after a specific character string (see col. 8, lines 35 – 41).
 - Identification data corresponds to the password that user entered to the document (col. 6, lines 34 – 38, 49 – 52).
- “Wherein said identification data is added to said document if said document includes said specific character string” col. 6, lines 30 – 33.
 - “Access to said document is limited in accordance with contents of said access controlling information, when the access to said document is thereafter requested, if said document contains added identification data” See the abstract and col. 7, lines 44 – col. 8, lines 28.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2 – 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okumo et al (U.S. 5,455,941) in view of Numao et al (U.S. 6,647,388).

♦ As per claim 2,

Okumo does not clearly disclose:

- “Said access controlling information further includes information indicating how the access to said document is limited and, when the access to said document is requested,

Art Unit: 2161

the access is defined by referring to said information indicating how the access is limited”.

However, Numao on the other hand, discloses a document management system for limiting user access to a registered document, comprising the teaching of “Said access controlling information further includes information indicating how the access to said document is limited and, when the access to said document is requested, the access is defined by referring to said information indicating how the access is limited” (See Fig. 6, col. 11, lines 35 – 42, col. 15, lines 11 – 35 of Numao). Numao teaches that the rule descriptions specify how the user can access the information. The system must check for the condition if the document can be converted to another format for display to user.

- Numao also teaches that the document can be accessed in a certain time only (col. 17, lines 1 – 9).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Numao into the invention of Okumo because the combination would increase the security of document by limiting access to document using the identification data and the specific character string.

♦ As per claims 3, 16, the combination of Okumo and Numao disclose:

- “Wherein it is defined whether or not said document ... includes said specific data at any one of time when said document is registered ... and time when the access to said document is request” See Fig. 4, 401, col. 9, lines 61 – 65 of Numao.

♦ As per claims 4, 12, 15, the combination of Okumo and Numao disclose:

Art Unit: 2161

- “Wherein said access controlling information further includes information to specify a person to be permitted to access with limitation” See col.8, lines 30 – 46, Fig. 3, 5, col. 11, lines 1 – 4 of Numao and col. 8, lines 35 – 41 of Okumo.
- ◆ As per claims 5, 9, 11, 14, the combination of Okumo and Numao disclose:
 - “Wherein said access controlling information further includes a valid term during which the access is limited” See col. 6, lines 23 – 37, col. 17, lines 3 – 9 of Numao.
- ◆ As per claims 6 - 8, 10, 13, the combination of Okumo and Numao disclose:
 - “Said controlling information is provided in a single record comprising a plurality of fields, including ID information for identifying said record, and said ID information is added to the document for relating said access controlling information to the document”
See Fig. 6 of Numao, wherein the Access control policy rules are disclosed. The rule includes plurality of fields (subject, object, conditions). The ID information corresponds to the object name or the target document to be accessed.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 3/6/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

◆ Applicant argues that Okuno's password is not used to control access (page 3 of the Remark). The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Referring to the abstract, Okumo teaches that “access to the data may be prohibited” based on the comparison between the generated codes (see the abstract), wherein the code is generated using the password and a block of data. Therefore, the password in Okumo is used to control access to the data.

Art Unit: 2161

♦ Applicant argues that Okumo does not disclose access control. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

As indicated above, the password is used to generated codes, therefore, the access to data may be prohibited based on the comparison of these codes. Clearly, Okumo does disclose access control to the data.

♦ Applicant argues that there is no mention the words “access”, “controlling”, “ control”, or “information” in the applied portion of the reference, nor is there any explanation in the Office Action of how the cited text and drawing amounts to a disclosure of “access controlling information”. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

See explain above. Further, in col. 27, lines 8 – 10, Okumo teaches that accessing to the text element is determined whether authorized or not. Clearly, Okumo does disclose access control to the data.

♦ Applicant argues that Okumo actively teaches against access control. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Since Okumo teaches a method for access control to the data as indicated above, Okumo does not teach away against access control.

♦ Applicant argues that the Examiner ‘s opinion is incorrect when considers that the access controlling information, specific character string and identification data according to the present invention correspond to the justification identification code, text element and password respectively. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Based on the comparison between the identification code (controlling information) that is composed of a specific character string (password) and an identification data (text element ID),

Art Unit: 2161

access to the data is limited (prohibited or permitted) (see the abstract of Okumo). Therefore, the Okumo reference still can be applied to the instant application.

♦ Applicant argues that Numao also does not disclose access control information. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner did not use Numao reference for this limitation. Instead, Numao reference is allied for the teaching of information indicates how the access to information is limited.

Therefore, Numao reference is not appropriated for this argument.

♦ Applicant argues that the password of Okumo is not for limiting user access, but rather for specifying a document creator. The Examiner respectfully disagrees based on the first augment. (See first respond for the first argument).

♦ Applicant argues that Okumo is silent on teaching appends the identification data to the document, and the identification data specifying the access control information corresponding to a specific character string if it is included in the document. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

As discussed above, the access to the document is limited based on the identification code. Therefore, the system must be able to appends the identification data to the document, and the identification data specifying the access control information corresponding to a specific character string if it is included in the document, in order to perform such comparison.

♦ Applicant argues that neither Okumo nor Numao teaches, “it is defined whether or not said document includes said specific character string”. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

In the Office Action mailed 10/5/2005, the Examiner clearly stated that the specific character string corresponds to the specific text of the document. This text is combined with the identification data (password) to generate a identification code. Therefore, in order to generate

Art Unit: 2161

the code, the system must define whether or not said document includes said specific character string.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CamLinh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4024. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Gaffin can be reached on (571) 272-4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571 – 273 - 8300.

Art Unit: 2161

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LN


FRANTZ COBY
PRIMARY EXAMINER